

**REMARKS**

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13, 17-22, 26, and 27 and amended claims 1, 14-16, 23-25, 28, and 29 are in this application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 10-16, 18, 19, 21-25, and 27-29<sup>1</sup> were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,668,890 to Winkelman in further view of U.S. Patent 5,699,489 to Yokomizo.

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

“...wherein said input common processing means performs either a noise reduction processing or MPEG processing.”

In explaining the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Winkelman “is not explicit what the device independent color space is, though several viable options are recognized.” To cure such defect, the Examiner appears to rely on col. 1, lines 44-53 and 14-21 and col. 5, lines 10-27 of Yokomizo. It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Yokomizo applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Yokomizo”) do not appear to teach the above-recited feature of claim 1. That is, Yokomizo appears to disclose a processing means for NTSC processing and not noise reduction processing or MPEG processing as in claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Winkleman and Yokomizo.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Examiner only listed claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 14-16, 19, 23-25, 28, and 29 as being rejected by the combination of Winkelman and Yokomizo, it is believed that the Examiner meant to list claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 10-16, 18, 19, 21-25, and 27-29 as being rejected by the combination of Winkelman and Yokomizo.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claims 14-16, 23-25, 28, and 29 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Winkleman and Yokomizo.

Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 10-13, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 27 depend from one of claims 1, 16, and 25, and due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Winkleman and Yokomizo for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,668,890 to Winkelman and U.S. Patent No. 5,699,489 to Yokomizo in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,050 to Sakarda.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 depend from one of claims 1, 16, and 25, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Winkleman and Yokomizo for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Sakarda to overcome the above-described deficiency of the Winkleman and Yokomizo combination. Accordingly, claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 are believed to be distinguishable over the applied combination of Winkleman, Yokomizo, and Sakarda.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to

Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Reg. No. 34,930

(212) 588-0800